

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed December 21, 2011, Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the rejections based upon the claim amendments and arguments submitted herewith. Claims 7-13 were last presented for examination, of which all were rejected or objected to, with the following issues being raised:

1. Claims 7-9 and 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 7,419,349 to Goodrich ("Goodrich") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,966,516 to Vartanian ("Vartanian");
2. Claim 10 objected to as depending from a rejected base claim, but otherwise being directed toward allowable subject matter.

Following the above amendments to the claims, claims 7-14 are pending in the application, with claims 7 being independent. The amendments to claim 7 and new claim find support at least in the paragraph beginning on page 4, line 23 of the specification as filed. Applicant submits that new claim 14 is allowable over the prior art of record at least for the reasons discussed below.

Applicant has not presently rewritten claim 10 in independent form, but reserves the right to do so to gain allowance of the subject matter that the Office Action indicates as distinguishing over the prior art of record.

Obviousness Rejections

Claim 7 was rejected as obvious over Goodrich in view of Vartanian. Obviousness requires a determination that the claimed invention, as a whole and in view of the cited references, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time it was made. MPEP 2142. Claim 7 has been amended to recite "a suspension cable operatively extending from the cable brake to affix to each of the moving floor sections, wherein the suspension cable passes through first and second guides in the first and second rectangular frames, respectively, near the first hinge". The combination of Goodrich and Vartanian do not teach or disclose this feature.

As indicated in the Office Action, Goodrich discloses the suspension cable "extending from cable break (198) to first and second frames (120 and 122) shown in

figures 20-22.” Office Action, page 4. Goodrich does not disclose the suspension cable affixed “to each of the moving floor sections”. Vartanian also does not teach or disclose this feature. For this reason, the cited combination does not render amended claim 7 obvious.

Claims 8-9 and 11-13 were also rejected as obvious over Goodrich in view of Vartanian, and each ultimately depends from claim 7. Where the cited combination does not render amended claim 7 obvious, it also does render any of the dependent claims obvious.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejections. Moreover, Applicant submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and such is earnestly solicited.

Applicant believes no extensions or fees are due with this response. However, if an extension is needed or a fee is due, please consider this a request therefor and charge Deposit Account No. 03-2775, under Order No. 21029-00312-US1, from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: February 20, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP

Electronic signature: /DMMorse/
David M. Morse
Registration No.: 50,505

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1007 North Orange Street
P. O. Box 2207
Wilmington, Delaware 19899-2207
(302) 658-9141
(302) 658-5614 (Fax)
Attorneys for Applicant